

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
FORT WORTH DIVISION

CARL D. CALHOUN II	§	
	§	
VS.	§	ACTION NO. 4:18-CV-00772
	§	
AISHA WATKINS, ET AL.	§	


ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

On September 20, 2018, the United States magistrate judge issued his proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation in the above-styled and -numbered cause (doc. 7). The magistrate judge gave all parties until October 4, 2018, to serve and file with the Court written objections to his proposed findings, conclusions, and recommendation. No written objections have been received from either party. See *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Assoc.*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1428-29 (5th Cir. 1996). As a result, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), de novo review is not required. Nevertheless, the Court has reviewed the magistrate judge's findings, conclusions, and recommendation for plain error and has found none.

Thus, after consideration of this matter, the Court concludes that the findings and conclusions of the magistrate judge should be and are hereby ADOPTED as the findings and conclusions of this Court. It is, therefore, ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis (doc. 3) is DENIED. Plaintiff's complaint will be subject to dismissal without further notice under

Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) unless Plaintiff pays to the clerk of Court the filing and administrative fees of \$400¹ *within* seven (7) days following this order.

SIGNED October 5, 2018.



TERRY R. MEANS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ In addition to the \$350 filing fee, the District Court Miscellaneous Fee Schedule, effective May 1, 2013, requires payment of an administrative fee for filing a civil action in district court of \$50. See 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a) and District Court Miscellaneous Fee Schedule, note 14.

